

**BEFORE THE STATE BOARD OF MEDIATION
STATE OF MISSOURI**

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF)	
FIREFIGHTERS, LOCAL 2945,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
v.)	Public Case No. R 96-032
)	
CALLAWAY COUNTY AMBULANCE DISTRICT,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

The State Board of Mediation is authorized to hear and decide issues concerning appropriate bargaining units by virtue of Section 105.525 RSMo. 1994. This matter arises from the election petition of International Association of Firefighters, Local 2945 (hereinafter referred to as the Union) to represent certain employees of Callaway County Ambulance District (hereinafter referred to as the Employer). The Union seeks to represent a bargaining unit of all full-time medical transport personnel and shift supervisors but excluding the director, the senior shift supervisor and all part-time employees. A hearing on the matter was held on August 15, 1996, in Fulton, Missouri, at which representatives of the Union and the Employer were present. The case was heard by State Board of Mediation Chairman, Francis Brady, employee member LeRoy Kraemer and employer member Lois VanderWaerdt. At the hearing the parties were given full opportunity to present evidence and make their arguments. The parties did not file briefs. After a careful review of the evidence and arguments of the parties, the Board sets forth the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Direction of Election.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Callaway County Ambulance District provides emergency medical service to the residents of Callaway County. This happens as follows. Emergency calls from citizens are received by a central dispatch facility which relays the pertinent information to the District. An ambulance crew from the District then responds to the call and provides whatever patient care is necessary. The District operates continuously year round and gets about 2,700 calls a year. Half of these calls are emergency calls and the remainder involve situations where someone is being transferred from one location to another (such as from a hospital to an extended care facility).

The District has two stations: one is located in Fulton and the other is in Holts Summit. The Fulton station is the main facility and the District's administrative offices and staff are located there. No administrative staff work at the Holts Summit facility.

The District has a board of directors which has overall authority over its operation. The six members of this board are elected from six areas of the county. The board makes policy for the District and approves all hirings and firings. The unpaid board members meet once a month at the District's main facility. They (the board members) are not usually present at the District's facilities and do not oversee any employees on a day to day basis.

Apart from the above noted board of directors, the District's organizational structure is as follows. The District's highest ranking employee is the director. He reports to the board of directors. Below the director is the senior shift supervisor. Underneath him are three shift supervisors. Underneath them are the paramedics and emergency medical technicians (EMTs). The paramedics and EMTs are hereinafter referred to collectively as medical transport personnel. There are about 15 full-time and 15 part-time medical transport personnel. The part-time employees work on an as needed basis. There are no employees underneath the medical transport personnel in the District's organizational structure. The medical transport personnel (both full-time and part-time) report to the shift supervisors. Thus, the shift supervisors are the first level of authority over the medical transport personnel. The shift

supervisors, in turn, report to the director. The District's only other employee is the office manager who reports to the director. In sum then, the District has a total of 21 full-time employees: the director, the office manager, the senior shift supervisor, three shift supervisors, and 15 medical transport personnel. The duties which these employees perform are identified below.

Director Charles Anderson is in charge of the day to day operations at the District and all its administrative functions.

Senior shift supervisor Russ Lumpkin essentially functions as the assistant director and assumes the director's duties in his absence. Lumpkin prepares the monthly work schedule, provides training programs and maintains associated records, monitors the District's quality assurance program, and maintains licensure records. In addition, Lumpkin performs all the duties of a shift supervisor (which will be identified later). The position of senior shift supervisor requires five years experience with the District as a shift supervisor.

The shift supervisors and the medical transport personnel serve on the ambulance crews that respond to the emergency calls which are received. They work side by side and try to work together as a team to deal with the emergency at hand. They perform their emergency response work in accordance with an extensive set of rules, policies and procedures which detail how they are to respond to a myriad of matters. All are licensed by the state. The medical transport personnel (both full-time and part-time) are required as a condition of employment to have a current state emergency medical technician (EMT) license. This is the basic license for medical transport personnel. If an employee wants, they can become certified as a paramedic and obtain a paramedic license. Thus, a paramedic has more training than an EMT. Because of this additional training, a paramedic assumes command at a medical emergency. About half of the District's medical transport personnel (both full-time and part-time) have a paramedic license. All of the shift supervisors (including the senior shift supervisor) have a paramedic license.

In addition to serving on the ambulance crews and responding to the emergency calls, the shift supervisors are in charge of their shift and responsible for whatever activity occurs therein. If something out of the ordinary arises and needs to be done while they are in charge, they decide how to handle it. They oversee the medical transport personnel on their shift both at the stations and in the field and ensure they perform their work promptly, professionally and in accordance with the District's policy manual. On occasion, they tell the medical transport personnel what duties to perform. They are the highest ranking employees present at the Fulton facility on the second and third shifts and on the weekends (i.e. 128 hours out of the 168 hours in a week).

The shift supervisors also perform the following duties on a daily basis. First, they sign the controlled substance records at the beginning and end of each shift, and ensure that the controlled substance records have been signed by the on-duty paramedic. This is required by state law. Second, they review and approve all time sheets of medical transport personnel. Third, they review all ambulance trip tickets which have been completed by the ambulance crews to ensure they comply with the District's standard operating procedure. Fourth, they complete a document known as the quality assurance improvement form and ensure that patient records and billing information is finished after every ambulance call. Fifth, they ensure that each ambulance run is entered properly in the logbook which is maintained at the Fulton facility. Sixth, they ensure that all ambulance, living quarters, and garage areas are cleaned and that the ambulances are restocked before the medical transport personnel going off duty are released. The shift supervisors perform these daily tasks along with the medical transport personnel. Seventh, they ensure that all assignments are completed. Finally, at the end of each shift they fill out a shift checklist form which documents the things that were done on the shift. This information is used to brief the incoming shift supervisor on what transpired on the previous shift so they are aware of same. It is unclear from the record how long it takes the shift supervisors to complete the paperwork referenced above. The paperwork that is

completed then goes to the business office which uses it to generate bills for the ambulance runs.

The District's staff work the following hours. The director and the senior shift supervisor work the day shift at the Fulton facility Monday through Friday. The medical transport personnel at the Holts Summit facility work 24 hour shifts. The shift supervisors and the medical transport personnel at the Fulton facility used to work 24 hours shifts too, but effective July 1, 1996, they all began working eight hour shifts with a 40 hour week. The three shifts at the Fulton facility are 8 A.M. to 4 P.M., 4 P.M. to midnight, and midnight to 8 A.M. The three shift supervisors work when the senior shift supervisor is not on duty. They work the same shifts on the same days each week. For example, shift supervisor Joseph Peeper works the second shift three days a week and the third shift two days a week. Each shift at the Fulton facility is usually staffed by three or four workers: a shift supervisor and two or three medical transport personnel. During the day shift Monday through Friday it is the senior shift supervisor and three medical transport personnel. The second and third shifts at the Fulton facility are staffed by a shift supervisor and two or three medical transport personnel. Each shift at the Holts Summit facility is staffed by two workers, both of whom are medical transport personnel. If a shift supervisor is absent, and the absence cannot be filled by another shift supervisor, then a senior paramedic becomes the acting shift supervisor. When this happens, they receive extra pay for doing so (namely \$1 an hour).

Two ambulances are staffed and operational at the Fulton facility on each shift while one ambulance is staffed and operational at the Holts Summit facility. Two employees are assigned to each vehicle. The shift supervisor decides which employee is assigned to which vehicle. When a call comes in, the shift supervisor decides which crew members (including him or herself) will respond to same.

If an employee calls in sick or is unable to report to work, the shift supervisor is responsible for finding a replacement so that the shift is adequately staffed. When this happens, the shift supervisor either works the shift themselves or calls in a part-time employee.

Full-time employees are not usually used as replacements because they (i.e. the full-time employees) would have to be paid overtime and the District tries to avoid paying overtime.

The medical transport personnel are occasionally transferred from one shift to another. When this happens, it is done by the director; not a shift supervisor.

The only promotion opportunities available for medical transport personnel are the shift supervisor positions. When those vacancies exist, Anderson decides who to promote. He makes this decision entirely on his own without seeking the counsel or recommendation of the other shift supervisors.

The last time someone was hired in the District, the hiring process worked as follows. Anderson reviewed the job applications that were received and decided who to interview. He then scheduled an interview with the applicants. He and the senior shift supervisor then interviewed the applicants. After the interviews were completed, Anderson and the senior shift supervisor decided who to hire and that candidate was approved by the board of directors. The shift supervisors played no role whatsoever in this particular hiring.

In previous hirings though, the three shift supervisors served on interview panels along with Anderson and the senior shift supervisor. In those instances, the shift supervisors asked some of the pre-set interview questions which were posed to the candidates. After the interviews were completed, the panel jointly decided on a finalist. The record does not indicate how the interview panel reached their decision on the finalist. Insofar as the record shows, Anderson accepted the panel's recommended finalist. Anderson then took the finalist to the board of directors for their approval, but it appears this step is a mere formality.

With regard to evaluations, the record indicates that the shift supervisors evaluate the medical transport personnel on their shift once a year. This involves filling out a preprinted evaluation form and rating the employee's performance in 14 areas using a scale which ranges from 0 ("unacceptable performance") to 5 ("superior performance"). A numerical rating is assigned to each of the 14 areas and then a total score is figured by dividing the tallied number by 14. This figure represents the evaluation average. The evaluation form also contains a

blank space in each of the 14 areas herein the rater can make written comments. After the shift supervisor fills out the evaluation form, it goes to Anderson for his review. Anderson decides what the employee's final rating will be. Anderson can change the evaluation if he wants, but he does not recall ever doing so. After Anderson reviews the completed evaluation, he returns it to the shift supervisor. The shift supervisor then sits down with the employee and goes over it (i.e. the evaluation) with them. The shift supervisor signs the evaluation. If an employee feels the evaluation has been unfair, they can appeal it to the director. If an evaluation is appealed, the director would have the final say; not the shift supervisor. The record does not contain any completed evaluation. Thus, it is unknown if the evaluations commonly contain written comments.

In 1994 and 1995, these evaluations were used as a basis for merit pay adjustments. This worked as follows. In both of those years, the final average score which was generated by the evaluation was multiplied by 2 cents. Thus, if an employee had an average score of 5 (the highest average score possible), the employee received a pay increase of 10 cents an hour (i.e. $5 \times .02 = .10$). Conversely, if the employee had an average score of 1 (the next to the lowest score possible), the employee received a pay increase of 2 cents an hour (i.e. $1 \times .02 = .02$). If an employee received an average score of 0 (the lowest average score possible), the employee did not receive any pay increase under this system. Thus, the total monies which could be generated under this system ranged from nothing to 10 cents an hour. The merit pay adjustments just referenced were granted only in 1994 and 1995. They did not exist prior to that. The District's board of directors has decided that merit pay adjustments will not be offered in 1996. Thus, the evaluations which are completed for 1996 will not generate any additional salary for employees.

With regard to discipline, until July 1, 1996, the director handled all discipline himself. Thus, prior to that date, the shift supervisors played no role whatsoever in the District's disciplinary process and had not disciplined anyone or recommended any discipline. Effective July 1, 1996, the District adopted a new disciplinary policy. Under this policy, shift supervisors

are still not empowered to suspend or discharge employees on their own volition; those decisions are still made by the director. The shift supervisors are empowered under this policy to issue verbal warnings and to recommend other forms of discipline to the director. Additionally, under this discipline policy, the shift supervisors are responsible for filling out a form entitled "Employee Disciplinary Action Report" which essentially documents the facts of a given situation. The record does not contain any examples of verbal warnings or other disciplinary action which have been given by shift supervisors to employees. The only instance documented in the record where a shift supervisor recommended disciplinary action to Anderson involved a factual situation where an employee failed to show up for work. When it happened, a shift supervisor (Peeper) told Anderson about it, whereupon Anderson told Peepers to fill out an (Employee Disciplinary Action Report) form, which he did. Peepers then made a recommendation to him regarding the matter but the record does not identify what that recommendation was. The record also does not indicate what disciplinary action, if any, was taken against the employee. Whatever decision was made, it was Anderson who made the call; not Peepers.

With regard to wages, the record indicates that the starting hourly rate for a paramedic is \$8.90 an hour, and the starting hourly rate for a shift supervisor is \$10.90 an hour. The only other evidence concerning the District's pay plan contained in the record is that employees receive unspecified longevity increases. It is unknown whether a pay schedule or pay ranges exist for the positions just referenced and, if so, how employees progress through same.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

IAFF , Local 2945 petitioned to be certified as the exclusive bargaining representative for a unit of all full-time medical transport personnel and shift supervisors of the Callaway County Ambulance District.

An appropriate bargaining unit is defined by Section 105.500 (1) RSMo. 1994 as:

A unit of employees at any plant or installation or in a craft or in a function of a public body which establishes a clear and identifiable community of interest among the employees concerned.

In this case there is no dispute per se concerning the appropriateness of a unit of full-time medical transport personnel. The only question raised by the Employer regarding the composition of the proposed bargaining unit concerns the inclusion of the shift supervisors within that unit. As a practical matter then, the Employer's question concerning the appropriateness of including the shift supervisors in the bargaining unit is subsumed into the question of their possible supervisory status. That being so, our determination herein concerning whether the shift supervisors are supervisors will be dispositive of whether they are included in the bargaining unit. With this caveat, we hold that in the context of this case, a unit of full-time medical transport personnel in the Callaway County Ambulance District is an appropriate bargaining unit within the meaning of the Missouri Public Sector Labor Law.

As just noted, at issue here is whether the three shift supervisors should be included in that unit. The employer contends they should be excluded from same on the grounds they are supervisors. The Union disputes that assertion.

The Missouri Public Sector Labor Law gives certain employees the right to form and join labor organizations and to present proposals to their employers relative to conditions of employment. Although supervisors are not specifically excluded from the law's coverage, case law from this Board and the courts have carved out such an exclusion. See Golden Valley Memorial Hospital v. Missouri State Board of Mediation, 559 S.W.2d(Mo.App. 1977) and St. Louis Fire Fighters Association, Local 73 v. City of St. Louis, Case No. 76-013 (SBM 1976). The rationale for the exclusion is that supervisors do not have a community of interest with, and therefore are not appropriately included in a bargaining unit comprised of, the employees they supervise. This exclusion means that supervisors cannot be included in the same bargaining unit as the employees they supervise. Since a dispute exists here as to whether the shift

supervisors “supervise” the medical transport personnel, it is necessary for us to determine if such is, in fact, the case.

This Board has traditionally used the following indicia to determine supervisory status:

- (1) The authority to effectively recommend the hiring, promotion, transfer, discipline or discharge of employees;
- (2) The authority to direct and assign the work force, including a consideration of the amount of independent judgement and discretion exercised in such matters;
- (3) The number of employees supervised and the number of other persons exercising greater, similar and lesser authority over the same employees;
- (4) The level of pay, including an evaluation of whether the person is paid for his or her skills or for his or her supervision of employees;
- (5) Whether the person is primarily supervising an activity or primarily supervising employees; and
- (6) Whether the person is a working supervisor or whether he or she spends a substantial majority of his or her time supervising employees.¹

We will apply those factors here as well. Not all of the above factors need to be present for a position to be found supervisory. Moreover, no one factor is determinative. Instead, the inquiry in each case is whether these factors are present in sufficient combination and degree to warrant the conclusion that the position is supervisory.²

Before applying those factors here, we have decided to make the following preliminary comments.

First, our ultimate determination herein is based on the record evidence; not on what words and phrases are used in a job description. Were it otherwise, an employer could exclude an employee from a bargaining unit by simply using conclusory terms such as “supervisor” and “management” in the job description which it creates. For example, in this case the applicable job description uses the following phrases: “the shift supervisor is a member of the

¹ See, for example, City of Sikeston, Case No. R 87-012 (SBM 1987).

² See, for example, Monroe County Nursing Home District, d/b/a Monroe Manor, Case No R 91-016 (SBM 1991).

management team, providing a link to upper levels of management”; “daily supervision of assigned ambulance crews”; “supervising staff clinical performance”; and “attending... supervisory... meetings.” Obviously, if one were to look no further than the shift supervisor’s job description, one would have to conclude from the foregoing phrases that the position is supervisory. Suffice it to say we will look further than just the shift supervisor’s job description. Second, it is apparent from the record that the District’s board members have personal opinions concerning whether they want the shift supervisors to be included in the bargaining unit. However, the wishes of the board members and their personal opinions concerning same are not controlling herein.

Having said that, attention is now turned to the above-noted factors. After applying them to the shift supervisors, we conclude they do not meet this supervisory test. Our analysis follows.

Attention is focused initially on factor (1). Insofar as the record shows, none of the shift supervisors have ever promoted or transferred anyone or laid anyone off. With regard to promotions, the only promotion opportunities available for medical transport personnel are the shift supervisor positions. When those vacancies exist, the director decides on his own who to promote; the shift supervisors have no input into same. With regard to transfers, the only examples of same documented in the record involve the transferring of employees from one shift to another. When that happens, it is done by the director; not the shift supervisors. With regard to layoffs, the record does not contain any examples of same.

That said, the shift supervisors exercise some responsibilities in three of the areas listed or inferred in factor (1), namely hiring, discipline and evaluations. An analysis of their role in those areas follows.

With regard to hiring, the shift supervisors do not hire on their own volition. All hirings are approved by the board of directors. In the last hiring which occurred, the shift supervisors

played no role whatsoever. Specifically, they neither interviewed candidates nor recommended who to hire. Anderson made that hiring decision without any input from the shift supervisors. In prior hirings though, the three shift supervisors served on interview panels along with the director and the senior shift supervisor. When they did, the shift supervisors had some input concerning which candidate to recommend to Anderson, but the record does not indicate what their level of input was. Since the shift supervisors have served on interview panels and afterwards jointly recommended a finalist to Anderson, it is apparent they have played a role in past hirings. However, when the shift supervisors made a hiring recommendation to Anderson, he was not obligated to follow it. Additionally, the last hiring shows that the shift supervisors are not an indispensable party in the District's hiring process because, as previously noted, in that hiring they played no part at all.

With respect to discipline, the record indicates that until recently, the shift supervisors played no role in the District's disciplinary process and had never disciplined anyone. All disciplinary decisions were handled solely by the director. This process changed on July 1, 1996, when the District adopted a different disciplinary procedure. Under its new disciplinary procedure, shift supervisors are still not empowered to suspend or discharge employees on their own volition, but they can issue verbal warnings and can recommend other forms of discipline to Anderson. The shift supervisors had apparently not issued any verbal warnings as of the date of the hearing because no examples of same are documented in the record. Insofar as the record shows, there has only been one instance where a shift supervisor recommended disciplinary action to Anderson. The record does not identify what the recommendation was. Whatever it was, Anderson made the ultimate call concerning whether discipline was imposed and, if so, how much. The foregoing convinces us that even under the District's newly adopted disciplinary procedure, the shift supervisors play a very minor role in disciplining employees. All they can do on their own is issue verbal warnings; anything more

than that would be handled by Anderson. While they can recommend discipline above an oral warning to Anderson, he is not obligated to accept their recommendation.

With respect to evaluations, the shift supervisors annually evaluate the medical transport personnel on their shift. In doing so, they complete a preprinted evaluation form and rate the employee's performance in a variety of areas. Their ratings are then tallied into a total numerical score and an evaluation average is figured by dividing the total numerical score by the number of categories. The completed evaluations then go to Anderson for his review. While Anderson can modify the completed evaluation if he wants, this has never happened. If an employee feels the evaluation is unfair and appeals it, the shift supervisor would not have the final say on the matter; Anderson would.

In 1994 and 1995, the point total generated on the evaluations were used by the District as a basis for awarding or withholding merit pay increases. Thus, in those two years the evaluations were tied to merit pay increases which were awarded. This happened as follows. In both of those years the final average score which was compiled was multiplied by 2 cents. The monies awarded under this system ranged from a minimum of nothing to a maximum of 10 cents an hour. In both those years, it was the board of directors that determined how much money was available for merit pay increases; not the shift supervisors. Nonetheless, in those two years the evaluations affected the employee's ultimate pay. The ability to award or conversely to withhold merit pay is certainly indicative of supervisory status. However, this indicia will not exist for 1996 because the District's board of directors has determined that merit pay adjustments will not be offered this year. Thus, the 1996 evaluations will not generate any additional salary for employees.

The focus now turns to factor (2), the authority to direct and assign the workforce. For a significant portion of each work week (namely the evening and night shifts and the weekends), shift supervisors are the highest ranking personnel present at the Fulton facility. During that

time they are officially in charge of that facility and responsible for handling whatever emergency situations arise. Additionally, as their title implies, shift supervisors are in charge of the medical transport personnel on their shift and oversee them on a daily basis. The shift supervisors also assign them work. This work of course is providing emergency medical service via ambulance calls. The shift supervisors monitor that work and ensure they perform it in accordance with the District's standard operating procedure. Due to their training though, the medical transport personnel know their job assignments and perform their duties with little direction. The shift supervisors also ensure that each shift is adequately staffed. If an employee calls in sick or absent, the shift supervisor fills that vacancy by either calling in a part-time employee or working the shift themselves. The foregoing persuades us that while the shift supervisors are certainly called upon to exercise their discretion and make decisions concerning emergency calls, they have a limited role in directing and assigning the work force.

Next, with respect to factor (3), it is noted that each shift supervisor oversees two or three employees at the Fulton facility (depending on the shift) and two employees at the Holts Summit facility. The shift supervisor oversees both groups of employees, although it is unclear from the record how someone at the Fulton facility can simultaneously oversee employees at the Holts Summit facility. In any event, there is nothing about the size of the combined group (i.e. four or five employees) that raise any "red flags" concerning the number of employees overseen.

The evidence on the second part of the third factor (i.e. the number of other persons exercising greater, similar or lesser authority with respect to the same employees) demonstrated that there are two levels of authority above the shift supervisors, namely the senior shift supervisor and the director. As a practical matter, the shift supervisors are at the bottom of the District's managerial hierarchy in terms of exercising control over the medical transport personnel.

With respect to the level of pay (factor 4), the record evidence shows that that starting wage for a shift supervisor is \$2 an hour more than the starting wage for a paramedic. In our view, this high starting wage simply reflects that the shift supervisors perform daily duties and responsibilities which are over and above those performed by the paramedics.

Finally, with respect to the last two factors, it is again noted that the shift supervisors are in charge of the four to five employees at the two facilities on their shift. They oversee them and ensure they answer emergency calls in accordance with the District's standard operating procedure. Additionally, the shift supervisors are in charge of the Fulton facility after 5 P.M. on weekdays and all of the weekends. That said though, the shift supervisors do the same work as the paramedics and EMTs (i.e. doing station duties and making emergency responses) and performing this work directly along side them. That being so, we are persuaded that while each shift supervisor directs four to five employees on a daily basis, they are essentially lead workers who oversee the emergency response which is performed.

To summarize then, the record indicates that the three shift supervisors perform, incidentally to their emergency response work, the following supervisory functions: they are in charge of the four to five employees on their shift and monitor their work performance, are also in charge of the Fulton station after 5 P.M. on weekdays and all of the weekends, can issue verbal warnings to employees and can recommend additional discipline, sometimes participate on interview panels which make hiring recommendations to the director, and annually conduct performance evaluations on the employees on their shift. In the past, these evaluations have been used by the District as a basis for awarding merit pay increases of up to 10 cents an hour. However, the factors just listed are not enough to qualify them as supervisors. Overall, they do not exercise sufficient supervisory authority in such combination and degree to make them supervisors. We therefore conclude that in this specific case, the shift supervisors are not supervisors.

ORDER

It is the decision of the State Board of Mediation that the three shift supervisors at issue here are not supervisory employees. They are therefore included in the bargaining unit with the full-time medical transport personnel. The description of the bargaining unit found appropriate is as follows:

All full-time medical transport personnel and shift supervisors of the Callaway County Ambulance District excluding the director, senior shift supervisor and all part-time employees.

An election is ordered therein.

DIRECTION OF ELECTION

An election by secret ballot shall be conducted by the Chairman of the State Board of Mediation, or its designated representative, among the employees in the aforementioned bargaining unit, as early as possible, but no later than 45 days from the date below. The exact time and place will be set forth in the notice of election to be issued subsequently, subject to the Board's rules and regulations. The employees eligible for vote are those in the unit who were employed during the payroll period immediately preceding the date below, including employees who did not work during the period because of vacation or illness. Those employees ineligible to vote are those who quit or were discharged for cause since the designated payroll period and who have not been rehired or reinstated before the election. Those eligible to vote shall vote whether or not they desire to have IAFF, Local 2945 as their exclusive bargaining representative.

The Employer shall submit to the Chairman of the State Board of Mediation, as well as to the Union, within fourteen calendar days from the date of this decision, an alphabetical list of names and addresses of employees in the aforementioned bargaining unit who were employed during the payroll period immediately preceding the date of this decision.

Signed this 30th day of October, 1996.

STATE BOARD OF MEDIATION

(SEAL)

/s/ Francis R. Brady
Francis R. Brady, Chairman

/s/ LeRoy Kraemer
LeRoy Kraemer, Employee Member

/s/ Lois VanderWaerd
Lois VanderWaerd, Employer Member